



THE ROCKEFELLER UNIVERSITY

1230 YORK AVENUE · NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10021

CONFIDENTIAL

May 19, 1978

Dr. Joshua Lederberg
Stanford University School of Medicine
Stanford, California 94305

Dear Josh:

At 1:00 today you asked me to place in writing whatever thoughts I may have on Dr. Gerald Gaull. At 2:45, Drs. Kappas and Ahrens briefed me on the new fiscal arrangements under which a possible Gaull appointment is being considered. The plan does place the question in a new light, and I am happy to think about the subject in the current context. Nothing is more important to the University than the new appointments.

I decided to start with a completely fresh appraisal by phoning Dr. Charles Scriver, Professor of Pediatrics, McGill University-Montreal Children's Hospital. He has known Gerry Gaull (as have I) since 1960, when I first met both of these pediatricians when they were in Dent's laboratory in London (Scriver received the Borden Award from the American Academy of Pediatrics in 1969). The following is an unedited transcript of Scriver's appraisal.

"Dr. Gaull is a good scientist who has made very significant contributions. The placement of taurine in an important position in human nutrition is a good accomplishment. He has recruited a good team and has published in journals with good peer review systems. The members of his team have given first-class reports at pediatric meetings. Gerry's own speeches have only been good half of the time; 50% of the time they have been disasters, as a result of inadequate preparation. Personally, I find Gerry a difficult person. If he were in my department, I would like him to be on another floor. Gerry has engaged in acrimonious debates with several scientists; I believe that one was with Harvey Mudd at NIH."

The above appraisal is in almost perfect synchrony with the one which I had obtained earlier from professors at Columbia-P and S. The facts seem clear. The action to be taken depends upon a weighing of the alternatives. One could argue that we already have some professors who fit the above description, and an appointment to Gaull would not be out of line. Even though we always search for good scholars with fully welcome personalities, they are not always available. All reviewers agree that Gaull is productive; and he is available.

The administrative decision is not an easy one to make and I would understand a decision either way.

Sincerely,

Stanford Moore

SM:sm